UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,852	09/22/2003	Bruce Wallman	CHA920030022US1	1382

45095 7590 05/24/2010

HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE ST
14 FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER	
TOLENTINO, RODERICK	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2439	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/667,852	WALLMAN, BRUCE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roderick Tolentino	2439	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03/09/2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4,5,7-9,11,14,15 and 17-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-5 7-9, 11, 14, 15 and 17-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 – 9, 11, 14, 15 and 17 – 22 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as necessitated by amendment by applicant on 03/09/2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically teachd or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4, 7 – 9, 11, 14 and 17 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramachandran et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2003/0084343) in view of Hay U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0120868) and Barnes et al. U.S. Patent No. (7,382,787).

5. As per claim 1, Ramachandran teaches a logical security system for processing login and password data received from a client device during a server session with the Internet server in order to authenticate a logged in user (Ramachandran, Paragraph 0009, login a user session with password) but fails to teach a physical security system for processing Internet protocol (IP) address information of the client device at the

Internet server in order to authenticate the client device for the duration of the server session, and a memory system for storing, at the Internet server, a list of each logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure, wherein the logical security system is configured to access the list to authenticate the logged in user, and wherein the physical security system is configured to separately access the list in order to authenticate the client device, wherein the physical security system includes a proxy server module for comparing only an incomplete portion of an IP address obtained from a received message against only a like incomplete portion of the reference IP address for the logged in user. However, in an analogous art Hay teaches a physical security system for processing Internet protocol (IP) address information of the client device at the Internet server in order to authenticate the client device for the duration of the server session (Hay, Paragraph 0012, IP Address to authenticate a user) and a memory system for storing, at the Internet server, a list of each logged in user and a reference IP address collected during a login procedure, wherein the logical security system is configured to access the list to authenticate the logged in user, and wherein the physical security system is configured to separately access the list in order to authenticate the client device (Hay, Paragraph 0012, List of authorized IP Addresses). And Barnes teaches wherein the physical security system includes a proxy server module for comparing only a portion of an IP address obtained from a received message against only a like portion of the reference IP address for the logged in user (Barnes, Col. 32 Lines 25 – 31, Matches some portion of the IP address).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Hay's method for dynamic server provisioning with Ramachandran's one protocol wed access to usage data in a data structure of a usage based licensing server because it offers the advantage of ensuring that a user cannot maliciously alter data/server (Hay, Paragraph 0008).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Barnes' Packet routing and switching with Ramachandran's one protocol wed access to usage data in a data structure of a usage based licensing server because it offers the advantage of reducing the risk that Packets are dropped (Barnes, Col. 3 Lines 23 – 28).

6. As per claim 4, Ramachandran as modified teaches the physical security system terminates the session for the user if the portion of the IP address obtained from the received message does not match the like portion of the reference IP address for the logged in user (Hay, Paragraph 0012, log error if IP is not authorized).

7. As per claim 7, Ramachandran teaches storing in a memory system, at the Internet server associated login data whenever a new server session is initiated on the Internet server from a client device (Ramachandran, Paragraph 0009, login a user session with password) but fails to teach a reference IP address and receiving a message from a requesting user at the Internet server; obtaining login data accompanying the message; obtaining an IP address from a message header in the message, determining if the login data of the requesting user is currently listed in the memory system as an existing session with the Internet server and if the login data of

the requesting user is currently listed, determining at the Internet server if the IP address from the received message matches the reference IP address associated with the login data of the requesting user, the determining of the IP address including examining only an incomplete portion of the IP address of the requesting user and determining if the portion matches only a like incomplete portion of the reference IP address. However, in an analogous art Hay teaches a reference IP address and receiving a message from a requesting user at the Internet server, obtaining login data accompanying the message; obtaining an IP address from a message header in the message (Hay, Paragraph 0012, IP Address to authenticate a user) and determining if the login data of the requesting user is currently listed in the memory system as an existing session with the Internet server (Hay, Paragraph 0012, List of authorized IP Addresses) and if the login data of the requesting user is currently listed, determining at the Internet server if the IP address from the received message matches the reference IP address associated with the login data of the requesting user (Hay, Paragraph 0012, List of authorized IP Addresses). And Barnes teacches the determining of the IP address including examining only an incomplete portion of the IP address of the requesting user and determining if the incomplete portion matches only a like portion of the reference IP address (Barnes, Col. 32 Lines 25 – 31, Matches some portion of the IP address).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Hay's method for dynamic server provisioning with Ramachandran's one protocol wed access to usage data in a data structure of a usage

based licensing server because it offers the advantage of ensuring that a user cannot maliciously alter data/server (Hay, Paragraph 0008).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Barnes' Packet routing and switching with Ramachandran's one protocol wed access to usage data in a data structure of a usage based licensing server because it offers the advantage of reducing the risk that Packets are dropped (Barnes, Col. 3 Lines 23 – 28).

8. As per claim 9, Ramachandran teaches the further step of terminating all server sessions listed in the memory system having the login data of the requesting user if the portion of the IP address from the obtained message does not match the like portion of the reference IP address (Hay, Paragraph 0012, log error if IP is not authorized).

9. As per claim 11, Ramachandran teaches a [[means]] a component for processing logical security information received from a client device during a server session in order to authenticate a logged in user (Ramachandran, Paragraph 0009, login a user session with password) but fails to teach [[means]] a component for processing Internet protocol (IP) address information of the client device in order to authenticate the client device during the server session by comparing the IP address of a received message against the list of IP addresses stored by the server; and [[means]] a component for storing, at the Internet server, a list of each logged in user and a respective reference IP address collected during a login procedure, wherein the component for processing logical security information is configured to access the list to authenticate the logged in user, and wherein the component for processing IP address information is configured to

separately access the list to authenticate the client device, wherein the component for processing IP address information includes a proxy server module for comparing only an incomplete portion of an IP address obtained from a received message against only a like incomplete portion of the reference IP address for the. However, in an analogous art Hay teaches [[means]] a component for processing Internet protocol (IP) address information of the client device in order to authenticate the client device during the server session by comparing the IP address of a received message against the list of IP addresses stored by the server (Hay, Paragraph 0012, List of authorized IP Addresses) and

[[means]] a component for storing, at the Internet server, a list of each logged in user and a respective reference IP address collected during a login procedure, wherein the component for processing logical security information is configured to access the list to authenticate the logged in user (Hay, Paragraph 0012, List of authorized IP Addresses). And Barnes teaches wherein the component for processing IP address information is configured to separately access the list to authenticate the client device, wherein the component for processing IP address information includes a proxy server module for comparing only an incomplete portion of an IP address obtained from a received message against only a like incomplete portion of the reference IP address for the logged in user (Barnes, Col. 32 Lines 25 – 31, Matches some portion of the IP address).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Hay's method for dynamic server provisioning with Ramachandran's one protocol wed access to usage data in a data structure of a usage

based licensing server because it offers the advantage of ensuring that a user cannot maliciously alter data/server (Hay, Paragraph 0008).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Barnes' Packet routing and switching with Ramachandran's one protocol wed access to usage data in a data structure of a usage based licensing server because it offers the advantage of reducing the risk that Packets are dropped (Barnes, Col. 3 Lines 23 – 28).

10. As per claim 14, Ramachandran as modified teaches the [[means]] component for processing IP address information terminates the session for the user if the portion of the IP address obtained from the received message does not match the like portion of the reference IP address for the logged in user stored in the list (Hay, Paragraph 0012, log error if IP is not authorized).

11. As per claim 17, Ramachandran as modified teaches the portion of the IP address includes the first characters of the IP address (Hay, Paragraph 0012, comparing to see if the IP address is an authorized IP address, portion is interpreted to be the entire address).

12. As per claim 18, Ramachandran as modified teaches the portion of the IP address includes the first characters of the IP address (Hay, Paragraph 0012, comparing to see if the IP address is an authorized IP address, portion is interpreted to be the entire address).

13. As per claim 19, Ramachandran as modified teaches, wherein the portion of the IP address includes the first characters of the IP address (Hay, Paragraph 0012,

comparing to see if the IP address is an authorized IP address, portion is interpreted to be the entire address).

14. As per claim 20, Ramachandran as modified teaches the IP address information is received from a proxy server capable of sending a plurality of IP addresses assigned to a plurality of client devices, and wherein the IP address includes a portion which is constant for each of the plurality of IP addresses (Hay, Paragraph 0012, IP Address to authenticate a user).

15. As per claim 21, Ramachandran as modified teaches the IP address information is received from a proxy server capable of sending a plurality of IP addresses assigned to a plurality of client devices, and wherein the IP address includes a portion which is constant for each of the plurality of IP addresses (Hay, Paragraph 0012, IP Address to authenticate a user).

16. As per claim 22, Ramachandran as modified teaches the IP address information is received from a proxy server capable of sending a plurality of IP addresses assigned to a plurality of client devices, and wherein the IP address includes a portion which is constant for each of the plurality of IP addresses (Hay, Paragraph 0012, IP Address to authenticate a user).

17. Claim 5 and 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramachandran et al. U.S. PG-Publication No. (2003/0084343) in view of Hay U.S. PG-Publication No. (2002/0120868) and U.S. Patent No. (7,382,787) and in further view of Muratov et al. U.S PG-Publication No. (2003/0097596).

18. As per claims 5 and 15, Ramachandran as modified teaches comparing IP addresses thru comparing authentication information transmitted and checking to see if the information including IP addresses match (Hay, Paragraph 0012, comparing to see if the IP address is an authorized IP address, portion is interpreted to be the entire address), but fails to teach deleting all instances of the logged in user. However, in an analogous art Muratov teaches deleting all instances of the logged in user (Muratov, Paragraph 0015).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Muratov's system for protecting data with Ramachandran's one protocol wed access to usage data in a data structure of a usage based licensing server because it offers the advantage of protecting data from unauthorized access (Muratov, Paragraph 0017).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roderick Tolentino whose telephone number is (571) 272-2661. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roderick Tolentino
Examiner
Art Unit 2439

Roderick Tolentino
/R. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2439

/Edan Orgad/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439